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The meeting was called to order at 10:55 a.m., Friday, June 28, 1991, by President of the Board, Mark S. Dodson, and on roll call the following answered present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Adams</td>
<td>Ms. Beverly Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bob Bailey</td>
<td>Mr. Rob Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tom Bruggere</td>
<td>Mr. George E. Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Britteny Davis</td>
<td>Mr. Les Swanson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Christopher Halsey</td>
<td>Ms. Janice Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark S. Dodson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chancellor's Office -- Chancellor Thomas Bartlett; Virginia L. Thompson, Board Secretary and Executive Assistant to the Chancellor; Ron Anderson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Personnel Administration; Roger Bassett, Director, Governmental Relations; Virginia Boushey, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Robin Brown, Associate Director, School Relations; Jerry Casby, Attorney-in-Charge, Education; Gary Christensen, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Shirley Clark, Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Francesca Clifford, Assistant Director of Communications; Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs; Melinda Grier, Director, Legal Services and Compliance Officer; Dale Hess, Special Assistant to the Director of Governmental Relations; Weldon E. Ihrig, Vice Chancellor, Finance and Administration; Larry Large, Vice Chancellor, Public Affairs; Jim Mattis, Assistant Attorney General; Roger Olsen, Director, OCATE; John Owen, Vice Chancellor, OCATE; George Pernsteiner, Associate Vice Chancellor, Facilities Division; Richard Perry, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administration and Information Systems Services; Davis Quenzer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Fiscal Policies; Michelle Warnke, Interim Director, Communications; Susan Weeks, Director, Institutional Research Services; Holly Zanville, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs.

Eastern Oregon State College -- President David Gilbert; Jim Lundy, Dean of Administration; James Hottois, Dean of Academic Affairs.
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Oregon Health Sciences University -- President Peter Kohler; Tom Fox, Vice President, Development and Public Affairs; Lesley Hallick, Vice President, Academic Affairs; Peggy Miller, Vice President, Finance.

Oregon Institute of Technology -- President Lawrence Wolf; Jim McAtee, Associate Dean, Academic Affairs; Doug Yates, Interim Dean of Administration.

Oregon State University -- President John Byrne; L. E. Coate, Vice President, Finance and Administration; Graham Spanier, Provost.

Portland State University -- President Judith Ramaley; Morris Holland, Vice President for Student Affairs; Steve Sivage, Acting Vice President, Finance and Administration; Nancy O. Tang, Vice Provost for Academic Program Operations; Charles Tracy, Associate Dean SUPA.

Southern Oregon State College -- President Joseph Cox; Ronald Bolstad, Dean of Administration; Stephen J. Reno, Dean of Academic Affairs.

University of Oregon -- President Myles Brand; Bob Bray, Editor, Inside Oregon; Gerald Kissler, Senior Vice Provost for Planning and Resources, Academic Affairs; Anne L. Leavitt, Associate Vice Provost, Student Affairs; Tracy Phelan, Assistant Director, Legislative and Community Relations; Chris Ramey, University Architect for Planning; Brodie Remington, Vice President, Public Affairs and Development; J. David Rowe, University Planner; Jean Stockard, Professor, Sociology; Gaye Vandermyn, Director, University News Bureau; Norman K. Wessels, Provost; Dan Williams, Vice President, Administration.

Western Oregon State College -- President Richard Meyers; Bill Cowart, Provost; Bill Neifert, Dean of Administration.

Interinstitutional Faculty Senate -- Herb Jolliff, Oregon Institute of Technology; Zoe Ann Holmes, Oregon State University; Bonnie Staebler, Western Oregon State College; Charles Wright, University of Oregon.
Others -- Jim Hill, The Oregonian; Kate Menard, Executive Assistant, Oregon Student Lobby; Kathy Randall, KMTR-TV; Paul Swangard, KEZI-TV; Vickery Viles, Acting Director, COCHE; Jeff Wright, Register Guard.

The Board dispensed with the reading of the minutes of the last regular meeting held on May 24, 1991, and approved them as submitted. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson.

Mr. Dodson indicated he had the pleasure of reading a certificate of recognition on the occasion of the retirement of W. T. "Bill" Lemman after 41 years of service to the Oregon State System of Higher Education. Before reading the resolution, Mr. Dodson personally thanked Mr. Lemman for his patience, guidance, and service.

CERTIFICATE OF RECOGNITION HONORING
W. T. LEMMAN
June 28, 1991

In recognition of the varied and significant contributions to the State of Oregon, the members of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education extend their heartfelt appreciation to Bill Lemman on the occasion of his retirement after 41 years of service to the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Bill is a person of many talents, having willingly served in several positions since beginning his career in 1950 as Assistant Business Manager at Vanport College (now Portland State University). He has held the positions of Vice Chancellor for Administration, Executive Vice Chancellor, Chancellor, and finally, Interim President of Oregon Institute of Technology.

His leaving is the end of a long and distinguished career in public higher education. Bill has guided the State System through good times and bad, through growth and decline, and through numerous changes in leadership at the institutions, on the Board of Higher Educa-
Chairpersons, in centralized activities, and state government.

Bill will be remembered as an intense, personable, and effective professional who approached his work realistically and with a dry sense of humor.

The Oregon State Board of Higher Education salutes Bill Lemman for his outstanding service and expresses special appreciation to his wife, Genna, for her many contributions through the years. We hope that he will enjoy many happy and rewarding experiences in the future.

Mr. Dodson moved for the adoption of the resolution and the conferring upon W. T. Lemman the title of Executive Vice Chancellor, Professor Emeritus of the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

The motion was approved with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swan son, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Lemman, in accepting the honor, indicated he had been blessed over the years to have the opportunity to work with an exceptionally fine group of people -- not only the present Board, but others -- beginning with Steven Epler, whose idea it was to establish Vanport College after World War II, thus bringing the college to the people. Mr. Lemman thanked past Portland State University Presidents Mylar and Wolf for 15 years at the institution; former Chancellors Lieuallen and Davis, and Chancellor Bartlett for the opportunities afforded in centralized activities; and a special thanks to the Board members over the years who "suffered my sense of humor and other attributes." In concluding his remarks, Mr. Lemman thanked the Board for the certificate of recognition and emeritus status.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Bartlett opened his report by asking Vice Chancellor Larry Large to report on a personnel matter.

Michelle Warnke

Dr. Large reminded the Board that Michelle Warnke joined the staff a year ago as Interim Director of Communications. He commented that Ms. Warnke had
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weathered one of the most challenging years in the recent history of the Board, and has done an excellent job. Her work has been characterized by close cooperation with the institutions, creation of a Marketing Advisory Committee, and orchestration of the news releases of State System responses to Measure 5. Chancellor Bartlett added his personal gratitude to Ms. Warnke for the fine service she has given to the State System.

Vice Chancellor Large indicated that, on July 15, 1991, Greg Parker will assume permanent responsibilities as Director of Communications for the State System of Higher Education.

Mr. Parker, who currently holds a similar position with the Oregon Department of Agriculture, has been on special assignment to the Governor and Executive Department, assisting on a variety of tasks related to the Governor's strategy on tax reform. Prior to his employment with the state, Mr. Parker was owner/operator of an Oregon radio news network covering 12 stations.

Legislative Update

In anticipation of the close of the Legislative session, Chancellor Bartlett remarked that higher education had come a long way during the session. Dr. Bartlett paid tribute to all -- Board members, presidents, and staff -- for the unified response presented to the Ways and Means Committee and legislators, indicating that attendance at hearings, preparation of materials (frequently on very short notice), and "talking the same line" had signaled to the public that we are a system and that, under pressure, the System did not fall apart. This has been a public show of cohesion, sending a clear message of how the System will function in the future. The Chancellor called on Roger Bassett to present a final legislative update, and thanked him for his role in the success of the session.

Mr. Bassett reported the State System operating budget was on the Governor's desk, having successfully passed both houses. He indicated that the budget included approximately $53 million in addback items and a manageable set of budget notes. Positive strides have been made in assisting legislators to understand the higher education budget.
process, and building relationships with key leadership.

Primary focus in the next biennium will be on achieving a more coherent working relationship between the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education. Through this forum, the Board of Education can express its view about the future of education in Oregon and the ways in which articulation can occur. Mr. Bassett observed that recommendations could reasonably be expected to develop around the issues in the next Legislative session.

The regular lottery and the State System request for decoupling sports action lottery both passed and have been signed by the Governor. This action represents a statutory accomplishment.

On the topic of replacement revenue, Mr. Bassett indicated that the emphasis has clearly shifted to the Governor's strategy. The Oregon Public Employees Union, the Oregon Business Council, and others are backing the Governor's strategy. The plan is being made public, and includes interviews with thousands of Oregonians. There will be ample opportunities for the State System to support one of Oregon's most sophisticated state-wide campaigns.

In closing, Mr. Bassett acknowledged the efforts of the legislative team, coalition with other lobbies, and the cooperative work of the staff.

Mr. Richardson commented that he had spent most of the last six months in Salem and, in all of his discussions with legislators, heard nothing but positive remarks regarding representatives from higher education.

The Chancellor indicated he had begun discussions with the Council of Presidents, urging a shift from a crisis orientation to one that will focus on 1993-1995, and the next biennium. Although the Legislature granted the Board discretion throughout the higher education budget process, there were clear policy signals and understandings of public interest. As careful public stewards, it is time to focus on those issues. The July Board Renewal offers an appropriate forum to begin these discus-
sions. Discussion papers are being prepared on an initial set of topics.

Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering

Chancellor Bartlett reported that the organizing meeting of the Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering Council was held June 10, 1991. Tom Bruggere, chair of the group, volunteered the half-time services of Dr. Geoff Bunza, a staff member of Mentor Graphics, to assist in start-up activities. The Council will meet on a regular basis for the next several months.

IFS Report

Chancellor Bartlett introduced Dr. Bonnie Staebler as the new chair of the Interinstitutional Faculty Senate (IFS). Dr. Staebler reported on the activities of the IFS during the past several months. Recently Senator John Kitzhaber and Representative Tony Van Vliet met with the IFS to discuss the impacts of Measure 5 and revenue replacement strategies. Dr. Staebler indicated the IFS agenda for the coming year would include regular participation of Board members and OSSHE staff. New officers have been elected: President, Bonnie Staebler; Vice President, James Pease; Secretary, Janice Jackson; Members at Large, Patricia Gwartneyu-Gibbs and Ed Brierty; representative to the Board Committee on Academic Affairs, Donna Jensen; representative to the Board Committee on Administration and Finance, Marjory Burns; alternates to the Board Committees, Anna Penk and Eugene Enneking.

Future Board Items

Chancellor Bartlett called on Vice Chancellor Weldon E. Ihrig to discuss two items that normally would come to the Board at the June meeting. Due to uncertainties existing until the Legislature adjourned, the annual budget normally presented at this time will come to the Board at the September meeting. Mr. Ihrig explained that the schedule would not cause any delays in beginning the fiscal year, since short-term spending targets have been given to each institution. Fall academic tuition and fees will come to the Board at the July meeting.

In 1990, The Board requested a report be made in June on the fiscal status of intercollegiate athletic programs. Passage of the sports action lottery represents a critical influence on the revenue side, but the decision regarding the lottery funds came too late for thorough analysis of
the impact. A complete report will be presented to the Board at the September meeting.

Introduction

Portland State University, in co-sponsorship with Oregon Health Sciences University, requests authorization to establish an Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies to be administratively located within Portland State University’s School of Urban and Public Affairs. The Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies is an integral part of "Higher Education in the Portland Metropolitan Area," an action plan to implement the Governor’s Commission Report that was reviewed and accepted as a preliminary action plan by the Board at its meeting on April 26, 1991. The principal function of the proposed Institute will be to identify and coordinate the application of academic resources at Portland State University, Oregon Health Sciences University, and other institutions of higher education, toward resolution of governmental issues identified by civic and governmental leaders, to include:

- sponsoring and funding public service research;
- facilitating exchange of information and transfer of knowledge; and
- providing a forum for public officials and citizens to discuss policy issues.

A Board-approved Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies at Portland State University will enable Portland State University, Oregon Health Sciences University, and other institutions to build better bridges to the greater metropolitan communities of the Portland area by focusing research resources on urban phenomena and concerns.

Staff Analysis

1. Relationship to Assigned Mission

Portland State University is in the process of developing a revised mission statement and a plan for new or expanded programs, including centers and institutes needed by the region,
with identification of those to be developed collaboratively with both Oregon State System of Higher Education institutions and other colleges and universities in the region. The Board has directed the Chancellor and President Ramaley to provide a status report on these developments no later than the September 1991 Board meeting. The proposed Institute is consistent with the expectation of the Board's Strategic Plan 1987-93 that Portland State University's centers and institutes conduct research and community service on issues that reflect the needs of Oregon's major metropolitan area. The recently approved "Action Plan to Implement the Governor's Commission Report on Higher Education in the Portland Metropolitan Area," provides a new framework for achieving the enduring goals of Portland State University while, at the same time, emphasizing the value of collaborations and partnerships in the realization of these goals.

2. Relationship to Board’s Requirement for Designation as an Institute

The proposed Institute is consistent with the Board's requirements for establishing centers and institutes:

- That the careful, considered institutional use of the center and institute mechanism be recognized by the Board as a legitimate, potentially valuable alternative approach to the furtherance of institutional mission through the fostering of interdisciplinary activities in pursuit of basic and applied research and instruction, the attracting of non-state funding in support of institutional mission and goals, the motivation of faculty, the creation of flexibility permitting the shifting of resources to new and different constituencies as the need is apparent, and the strengthening of academic departments.

- That the Board establish the principle that the justification for establishment of centers and institutes must be in terms of their potential for contributing
to the achievement of the institutional mission.

- That the fact that federal or other non-state funds can be secured to fund totally or, in principal measure, a given center or institute cannot be considered justification for the establishment of the center or institute. The real test of justification must be in terms of the extent to which the objectives of the proposed center or institute can be wholly consistent with, and fully supportive of, the institution's mission. Failing the test, the center or institute ought not be established.

3. Evidence of Need

The last decade and, more specifically, the past eight months in Oregon, have been characterized by serious challenges experienced by local governments in their efforts to provide and support the kinds and levels of services desired by constituents. Local problems related to taxation policies have been further affected by the federal government's decentralization of burdens and responsibilities onto state and local governments. These adverse fiscal environments in many states are challenging institutions of higher education, particularly those situated in urban areas, to join forces with governing bodies to conduct public service research on complex economic and social policy issues. As indicated in the Governor's Commission Report and in the recent Action Plan, the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies will be one of several structural ways to advance partnerships in service to state and regional needs.

4. Quality and Activities of the Proposed Institute

Public service research requires the application of expertise and objectivity to identified complex policy issues. The requisite expertise and trained capacity for analysis is available within the School of Urban and Public Affairs at Portland State University,
Oregon Health Sciences University, and other higher education institutions. The proposed Institute would identify expert capacity and coordinate resources to address issues. The Institute would serve as an access point for public agency leaders.

Three primary areas of activity are anticipated. The first, research, would include issue identification by the governing board of the Institute. The second is information exchange and transfer of knowledge through various types of dissemination of results and policy alternatives. The third activity is public forums within which concerns could be shared and responses developed.

5. **Adequacy of Resources to Establish the Institute**

**Support Staff.** Unlike many other State System centers/institutes that list specific affiliated faculty, the proposed Institute would serve as a coordinating or brokering mechanism drawing in faculty and students as specific expertise is needed relative to problems and issues at hand. However, a 1.0 FTE academic position is needed for a director of the Institute. The director will report to the Dean of the School of Urban and Public Affairs and will work with designated liaison officers from participating Oregon State System of Higher Education and other institutions. In support of Institute activities, a 1.0 FTE office specialist will be needed to perform staff functions.

**Facilities.** The proposed Institute will require at least two adjoining offices with appropriate furniture and equipment. These facilities are available at Portland State University.

**Library.** No special library requirements at Portland State University, Oregon Health Sciences University, or elsewhere have been identified as required before Institute activities commence.

**Budget.** The proposed Institute will start
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with minimal staffing of 2.0 FTE positions and two offices on the Portland State University campus. Program budget for research, information exchange/dissemination, and public forums will be adjusted to available resources. The desired outcome of Oregon State System of Higher Education's 1991-1993 legislative request, unknown at this time, permits an allocation of basic support for the infrastructure of the Institute. However, the majority of funding must come from non-state sources. Governing bodies in the Portland area have indicated a willingness to contribute to an estimated annual budget of $500,000. Dean Nohad Toulan of the School of Urban and Public Affairs also has suggested the importance of fundraising beyond the support anticipated from governing bodies. In sum, the budget is only grossly estimated at this time due to a lack of closure on the State System's 1991-1993 state support and the elasticity inherent in estimating project-specific voluntary contributions.

6. Issues

The proposal for the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies should be considered a framework for a set of functions that will continue to develop under the leadership of Portland State University and in cooperation with other participants. Specifically, further development of the framework is needed:

• to foster the meaningful collaboration among institutions that will expand the expertise available to address problems;

• to define the role of the governing board and its membership in support of a viable and responsive Institute; and

• to develop a detailed budget to carry forward the important work of the Institute.

7. Program Review

The proposal for the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies was reviewed by the Aca-
demic Council at its meeting on May 23, 1991. The Council was supportive of the Institute and encouraged the development of it as a collaborative model.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

The staff recommended that the Board authorize, in principle, Portland State University, in co-sponsorship with the Oregon Health Sciences University, to establish the Institute of Portland Metropolitan Studies effective September 1, 1991, pending availability of funds, and development of a specific budget based upon those funds.

The staff further recommended that the Institute establish effective mechanisms to encourage collaboration with other State System colleges and universities and with other higher education institutions in the Portland area, maximizing resources available to address metropolitan issues.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

President Judith Ramaley indicated the concept of the Portland Metropolitan Studies Institute began in 1986 by Dr. Nohad Toulan. The plan has received endorsement from Clackamas County, Multnomah County, and the City of Portland. Portland has allocated $100,000 for start-up of the activities of the Institute. The basic functions of the Institute will be public service; information exchange and technology transfer; and sponsorship of public forums on topics of concern to the greater metropolitan area.

The Committee recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation and place the item on the July Board consent agenda for final action.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board approved the Committee recommendation and placed the item on the July consent agenda. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.
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Introduction

In May, 1991, campuses were asked to respond to three sets of questions regarding the status of minority group recruitment and retention plans. This staff report includes a summary of those responses, staff analysis, and recommendations. As part of the presentation to the Board, several campuses will be asked to report on activities that best characterize the status of plans and continued efforts to achieve campus diversity.

A Summary of Campus Responses to Questions Regarding the Status of Minority Group Recruitment and Retention Plans

1. Is your campus primarily in the development or implementation phase of plans for minority group recruitment and retention? Have there been any significant institutional changes which have had an impact on the development or implementation of your campus plan?

As reported to the Board in December, 1990, campuses submitted proposed plans for minority group recruitment and retention to the Chancellor’s Office in May-June, 1990. Currently, five campuses report being in the implementation phase of their plan. Implementation refers to the process of putting campus activities and decisions into place and following through to achieve planned recruitment and retention goals and objectives. The development phase refers to the process of completing or revising the proposed plan on campus. Responses from each campus highlighted important activities contributing to efforts to enhance or achieve campus diversity.

Specific campus responses include the following:

- Oregon State University’s Minority Action Plans have provided the framework for efforts to diversify the campus. In addition, student groups are actively involved in minority group recruitment and retention efforts and cultural diversity programming. The Board of Visitors for Minority Affairs, which includes community representation from minority groups, has been instrumental in the development and implementation of campus plans.
Western Oregon State College, Eastern Oregon State College, and Oregon Health Sciences University have indicated that they are in the process of implementing their recruitment and retention plans. However, these campuses report restrictions on efforts to implement some aspects of recruitment plans, particularly for faculty, due to Measure 5 reductions. Western Oregon State College has indicated that student recruitment and retention plans will be implemented as resources permit. Hiring of tenure track faculty has been frozen because the fiscal impact of Measure 5 and reduction requirements. Likewise, Eastern Oregon State College notes that recruitment efforts outlined in their plan are dependent upon funding, and Measure 5 reductions have delayed the implementation of recruitment efforts. Oregon Health Sciences University refers to significant institutional changes that may result from the institution's response to budget reductions.

The President of Portland State University has directed senior staff to assume the responsibility for implementing the campus plan. The President's Executive Committee will be responsible for coordinating and monitoring progress. Portland State University also makes note of Measure 5 reductions, along with administrative reorganization, as having an adverse impact on implementation of the plan.

Three campuses are in the developmental phase of recruitment and retention plans. At the University of Oregon, the campus community engaged in a year-long strategic planning process. Within this process, a Task Force on Affirmative Action had responsibility for continuing the assessment of the educational and social environment, refining goals and objectives, identifying data programs and plans needed, and establishing a mechanism for campus-wide dialogue on meeting recruitment and retention goals. The University of Oregon will seek campus input over the summer and early fall before formally adopting a strategic plan.

The Oregon Institute of Technology plan has
re-entered the developmental stage. The campus will revise the proposed 1990 plan in light of the appointment of a new President, who is concerned with enrollment issues, and new appointments of a Director of Admissions and a Director of International and Ethnic Student Affairs. The campus intends to re-focus its recruitment base for minority group students. In past years, Oregon Institute of Technology has attracted a substantial number of minority students, primarily out-of-state residents. The campus administration plans to increase its efforts to reach more Oregon students, particularly in the Portland area. The institution will finalize a plan for implementation no later than January, 1992.

Southern Oregon State College has initiated a number of strategies to address areas related to the recruitment and retention of under-represented minority students. However, the campus remains in the developmental stage. Southern Oregon State College reports that progress towards finalizing a plan has been slowed due to a preoccupation with Measure 5 reductions. In particular, the campus had to reorganize the academic administrative structures along with cutbacks in programs and services. As a result, the institution notes that these changes have hampered its ability to identify specific enrollment disparities across the disciplines to establish realistic school recruitment goals. The institution has faced the related dilemma of locating new resources to fund additional recruitment activities and increased support services for minority group students. Southern Oregon State College will finalize a plan for implementation no later than January, 1992.

2. **If your campus plan is in the developmental phase, what specific steps have been or will be taken in 1991 to finalize it and move it to implementation?**

During the 1990-1991 academic year, the University of Oregon developed a comprehensive campus-wide strategy for increasing campus diversity among students and faculty as one of the goals in the strategic planning process. Responsibility
for achieving many of the identified goals rests with the dean of a school or college, the affirmative action officers of departments, the Office of Multicultural Affairs, the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, and the Office of Human Resources.

Although the strategic planning process will not conclude until the 1991-1992 academic year, the Office of Admissions has moved beyond the planning process into the second phase of implementation. The Office's 1991-1992 Multicultural Recruitment Plan identifies a number of strategies to be used in identifying and recruiting students of color. One unique aspect of the Multicultural Recruitment Plan is the use of joint appointments between the Office of Admissions and the Office of Multicultural Affairs. The admission counselor/academic advisor position provides a linkage between the process of admission and the academic/social realities of student life, thereby facilitating both recruitment and retention of students. Campus administrators believe this approach has had a major impact on efforts to recruit effectively students of color over the past two years.

Despite the financial implications of Measure 5, the University of Oregon was able to make a commitment to retain faculty of color through reassignment or reorganization. Also, a new "Paradox" data base will enable the campus to better monitor progress in recruitment and retention of faculty. Two other related areas to which the campus has devoted attention are: (1) the educational and social environment; and (2) the curriculum for the year 2000. In the case of educational and social environment issues, the University of Oregon has conducted surveys of students and faculty of color that verified subtle forms of attitudinal racism on campus and the need for increasing the presence of faculty and staff of color in both numbers and voice in policy directions. The campus recently has announced a campaign against discrimination on campus. The campus is considering recommendations for changes in curriculum to help meet goals of warm and hospitable environments, and adequate student preparation for the demands of a multicultural and international climate.
At Oregon Institute of Technology, work will begin this summer to refine the proposed plan submitted in 1990. A primary concern is that the previous estimates for resources to implement the plan are unrealistic under Measure 5 constraints. Nevertheless, steps have been taken. For example, the appointment of a full-time International and Ethnic Student Affairs Coordinator has increased the institution's efforts to assess minority student needs. The Enrollment Management Committee has recently been augmented and funds appropriated to allow greater flexibility in addressing recruitment issues.

Among the steps to be taken by Southern Oregon State College to finalize the plan and move into implementation are: (1) redefine the composition of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Minority Affairs; (2) establish recruitment goals; (3) implement, monitor, and refine the minority scholarship program; and (4) establish monitoring and reporting procedures. The campus has implemented many activities over the past academic year to enhance diversity. For example, an Hispanic Clearinghouse has been established to provide community outreach to the Rogue Valley Hispanic community. Also, a Multicultural Center was established as a meeting place for ethnic minority organizations and a location for cultural displays. Related to faculty and staff, the campus has concluded a study of areas of employment disparity and established long range goals to reduce the disparities.

3. If your campus plan is in the implementation phase, are mechanisms now in place to coordinate strategies and to assess progress toward achieving stated goals and objectives? What specific actions have been and/or will be implemented to achieve stated campus goals and objectives?

At Oregon State University, the Provost and the Affirmative Action Office provide the direction for implementing the Minority Recruitment and Retention Program. The program is comprised of individual academic unit Minority Action Plans. A Minority Affairs Commission (composed of faculty, staff, and students) is charged with overall progress in each of the colleges and admin-
istrative units that are expected to regularly document and revise their stated goals and objectives. Monitoring will be a continuing responsibility of the Commission.

A racial harassment incident at Oregon State University in the fall of 1990 precipitated the start-up of a number of special programs focusing on the importance of understanding other cultures and the implications and ramifications of racial harassment. One immediate outcome was the development and adoption of the Discriminatory Harassment Policy. In addition, the Office of Multicultural Affairs will be established in the fall of 1991 in response to campus needs and recommendations from the Board of Visitors for Minority Affairs. This office will work directly with the Affirmative Action Office, Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and others. The director of the office will report to the President. The office also will include a coordinator for Indian Affairs.

At Portland State University, the President’s Executive Committee will be responsible for coordinating and monitoring the campus plan. Included among the activities pursued or completed are: (1) acquiring grant support for minority group scholarships, particularly for graduate students; (2) appointing a new assistant dean for minority student affairs; (3) reorganizing enrollment management and student efforts—the Minority Recruitment Program and Admissions Office have developed a coordinated recruitment plan with responsibilities and time lines; and (4) developing and implementing a Minority Mentoring and Leadership Development Program for which a Kellogg Foundation grant is being sought. In addition to these activities, the Faculty Senate unanimously passed a resolution encouraging the Academic Requirements Committee to consider adoption of undergraduate curriculum requirements regarding ethnic awareness; the Committee actively has addressed this issue. A comprehensive plan to address issues of sexual harassment is being developed by Student Legal Services, Student Development, and Women’s Faculty Caucus. The Affirmative Action Office is ready to implement the plan once it’s developed. Finally, the Targeted Opportunity program has
provided support for the recruitment of minority group faculty and several new faculty have been hired.

Progress at Western Oregon State College will be monitored by a campus committee and through regular administrative channels. The campus has made contact with potential faculty from designated target populations. However, Western Oregon State College reports that a lack of funding for additional tenure track positions and supplemental funding to assist with program costs have precluded further action towards program implementation.

The Dean of Student Affairs has overall responsibility for monitoring Eastern Oregon State College's plan. The campus hired a new director for the Native American Student Program. Eastern Oregon State College relies heavily on the Oregon State System of Higher Education Minority Achievement Scholarship Program to achieve goals in minority group recruitment and retention. Plans to hire a minority student advisor were dropped as a result of Measure 5 reductions. The campus has had some success in recruiting new minority faculty. Two faculty from minority groups were hired in 1990-1991. The campus encourages initiatives for Oregon State System of Higher Education-established graduate support. The campus is particularly interested in a proposed component of the faculty recruitment plan calling for scholarships for minority group students to pursue advanced study in exchange for agreements to return to campus in a professional capacity for a minimum amount of time.

At Oregon Health Sciences University, in-house training activities include cross-cultural awareness and appreciation, and sexual harassment recognition and prevention. A policy designed to provide additional consideration for retaining under-represented staff in management service classifications in the event of a reduction, has been approved. Also, approval has been given to fund activities such as visiting professorships and forgiveness of debts to under-represented students. New programmatic linkages are being developed involving Affirmative Action, Multicultural Affairs and various academic units to
provide combined educational employment opportunities for under-represented students.

Staff Analysis and Proposals for Further Consideration

1. Each campus has identified efforts that have been, or will be, made related to minority group recruitment and retention. Completion of an overall strategic planning process, changes in administrative leadership, and Measure 5 reductions have contributed to several campuses remaining at the developmental stages of planning. However, all campuses in the development phase have identified specific steps leading to the adoption and implementation of a plan by January, 1992.

In order to begin establishment of a System-wide process for assessing progress and for better facilitation of campus efforts, staff suggests that a senior-line administrator on each campus (where this is not already the case) be assigned the responsibility of coordinating all campus efforts in achieving its plan. Furthermore, this group of campus administrators should meet at least three times a year to review and assess campus concerns that should be addressed on a System-wide basis, including policies for effectively and appropriately accounting for campus progress. The Oregon State System of Higher Education Academic Affairs staff will provide administrative support to this committee.

2. An important area of concern on most campuses is funding for programs for minority group students at the graduate level. The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, Portland State University, and Eastern Oregon State College have made reference to the need for funds or to the minimal amount of available campus-based support. The State System has worked with the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) on a doctoral scholars program proposal to increase the pool of under-represented minority group students for college and university teaching. The program, with foundation support, would involve 16 WICHE states over five years and
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would fund two-to-five new scholars each year in graduate programs in the region. Each state would be responsible for scholarship support beginning in the second year of the sponsored student's program until that student completes the Ph.D. degree. The scholar would agree, upon completion of the doctoral program, to return to the state that supported him/her, to teach year-for-year of support; or, if no suitable position is available in that state, in any of the participating states.

This program has appeal to some campuses. However, graduate deans place higher priority on direct funding to the campuses from the System or the state. Consideration should be given to the development and funding of a graduate support program for minority students. Staff will report to the Board at a future meeting regarding the development of alternatives for graduate level support for minority group students.

3. The educational and social environment of the campus, relative to cultural sensitivity and awareness, has emerged as a crucial area of concern. The University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and Portland State University make particular reference to multicultural-based activities, curricular review, and anti-discrimination programs. An illustrative event is the System-wide Faculty and Professional Staff of Color Forum held on May 31, 1991. The Forum was organized by the Interinstitutional Minority Student Affairs Committee (IMSAC) and sponsored by the Chancellor’s Office. Comments from more than 110 participants called for increased communication with minority group faculty and staff about their status on campus, particularly related to promotion and tenure issues. Participants also noted that equal educational opportunity and multicultural awareness from the perspective of minority groups must be given greater attention.

One recommendation coming out of the Forum was to broaden IMSAC’s charge from specific emphasis on student issues to minority group issues
in general. This would suggest that the group become the Interinstitutional Minority Affairs Committee and would require that the Committee membership be reconfigured to include campus representatives from both student affairs and faculty/academic areas. The charge should be reformulated to focus on expanding the participation of minority groups in Oregon State System of Higher Education. The Committee would develop and recommend mechanisms for incorporating a multicultural voice in system-wide and campus efforts to achieve diversity.

These proposals need further discussion and refinement before specific plans and recommendations can be made. Staff will present a report to the Board in December, 1991, regarding these and related matters.

Committee Discussion

Dr. Thomas Coley, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, discussed the report with the Committee. Representatives from Oregon State University, Portland State University, University of Oregon, and Southern Oregon State College provided additional details on the status of their plans.

The Committee expressed concern that the planning and implementation processes are not going as well as the Committee expected, and that institutions should not use the passage of Measure 5 as a rationale for failure to move plans along. Mr. Richardson and Mr. Miller indicated that perhaps a siege mentality is required and that campuses must continue to consider this an area of highest priority.

Mr. Richardson reminded the Committee that, at least since 1986 when he was appointed to the Board, minority recruitment and retention have been considered primary areas of concern. The State System has an excellent vehicle for recruitment in the minority tuition waiver program that has been successful, but this still has not netted sufficient results. "I don't think the Board is going to relax its standards at all in this area," Mr. Richardson continued, "and institutions should continue current efforts and step up activity to bring about Board policy set a number of years
ago." There was agreement that the System cannot accept defeat; continued effort is required.

Mr. Miller observed that the numbers of recruitment and retention of minority students and faculty never change, and therefore, something must not be working right. One question raised was whether there were too many different programs and approaches that might be consuming valuable resources and that uniformity of themes or programs among campuses might be both cost and effort efficient. Dr. Coley indicated that a "top down" approach does not work and that institutions must be granted latitude to pursue initiatives uniquely suited to their campuses.

Ms. Jackson asked for a brief report on the effectiveness of the May 31 Forum. Dr. Coley reported that approximately 115 individuals participated, representing almost one-fourth of the faculty and staff of color in the System. He indicated that the environment for the Forum had been good and individuals felt rewarded that their needs and concerns were being heard. Generally, individuals indicated that they did not feel a part of their campus community and that many of the initiatives to assist in strengthening these relationships would not require additional resources.

Mr. Miller concluded the report of the Committee by underscoring the importance of this matter and indicating the Board should anticipate regular updates and indicators of accomplishment of goals.

(No Board action required)

Staff Report to the Board

During the 1989 Legislative Assembly, the Board’s staff and institution representatives supported legislation, subsequently signed by the Governor, which enabled the State Board to authorize State System employes to consult, make public appearances, give speeches, work with private companies that have licensed intellectual property from an institution, and accept remuneration for such services without violating state ethics statute ORS 244.040. ORS 351.067, signed by the Governor in 1989, is presented below.
Following passage of ORS 351.067, the staff brought to the Board for its approval on April 20, 1990, Internal Management Directives 4.005 and 4.010 that created Board policy permitted under ORS 351.067. The IMDS require institutions to adopt policies and procedures that implement the Board's IMDS. The Board's IMDS also require, among other things, that institutions adopt policies that define faculty time available for outside activities (such as one day per week) so that such activities do not interfere with or impair institutional duties and responsibilities, and identify institutional administrators who must review and approve written faculty requests to engage in outside activities. IMD 4.010(6) also provides criteria that institutional administrators should consider when reviewing written requests to engage in outside activities.

The 1991 Legislative Assembly has approved and submitted for the Governor's signature amendments to ORS 351.067. The Board's staff was given ample opportunity by the House Committee on State and Federal Affairs to offer suggestions for further amending the proposed legislation, and subsequently concurred with the final version, conferring with appropriate institution officials regarding the legislation.

The 1991 amendments to ORS 351.067 are shown below. Generally, they require that outside activities comport with the mission of the institution and State System, faculty reporting of potential conflict of interest created by authorization or receipt of compensation for outside activity, adoption, by the State Board, of rules governing employee outside employment and activities, including potential conflict of interest as defined by Board rules consistent with ORS 244.020(8), and adoption of procedures for reporting and hearing of potential or actual conflict-of-interest complaints.

The amendments to the Board's OAR 580-21-025 and IMDS 4.005 and 4.010 being presented for Board consideration are shown below. The new material is underlined. The amended statutes, Board's rules, and Internal Management Directives enable the Board and institutions to retain authority and responsibility for reviewing and approving outside activi-
ties, authorizing acceptance of compensation and other forms of remuneration, and carefully monitoring outside activity so that potential or actual conflict of interest is avoided.

The staff-recommended amendments to the Board's OAR 580-21-025 and IMDs 4.005 and 4.010 have been reviewed and approved by the Academic and Administrative Councils, and institution presidents.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board approve the amendments to OAR 580-21-025 and IMD 4.005 and 4.010 as presented below:

OREGON BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

[PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES--]OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT AND ACTIVITIES: CONFLICT OF INTEREST
580-21-025

(1) No full-time employe of the Department or of any of the institutions or divisions shall engage in any outside employment which substantially interferes with duties. See also IMD 4.005 and 4.010. Board and Institution Policy on Outside Activities and Related Compensation.

(2) Institution employes shall provide written reports to their president regarding potential conflicts of interest as defined under ORS 244.020 (8). Other Department employes shall provide the same reports to the Chancellor. Complaints by any person regarding potential conflicts of interest may be referred for investigation to the president, Chancellor, or Director of Internal Audit who shall investigate the complaint.

NOTE: [Brackets] denote deletion. Underlining denotes added language.

OREGON STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION
INTERNAL MANAGEMENT DIRECTIVES

4.005 Board Policy on Outside Activities and Related Compensation
(1) The term faculty, as used below, means a person in the unclassified services as defined in ORS 240.207.

(2) Faculty may engage in outside consulting or other work so long as it does not impair their institutional obligations.

(3) Laboratory and other institutional facilities and resources, including support staff and stationery, shall not be used in outside work for which the faculty member receives remuneration unless expressly authorized by the institution.

(4) Remuneration received in accordance with IMD 4.005 and 4.010 from sources outside of the Oregon State System of Higher Education shall be considered official salary, honorarium, or reimbursement of expenses for purposes of ORS 244.040 [and shall not be considered a potential or actual conflict of interest for purposes of the Oregon Public Officials Ethics laws.] Receipt of such compensation does not have to be reported under 4.010(4) or (5) below unless the outside work creates a potential conflict of interest as defined in ORS 244.020 (8).

4.010 Institution Policy on Outside Activities and Related Compensation

Each institution shall adopt policies and procedures to implement 4.005 to 4.010. Such policies and procedures shall:

(1) Include appropriate measures, such as one day per week, which define faculty time available for outside activities related to the faculty member's institutional responsibilities. Outside activities unrelated to institutional responsibilities and undertaken by faculty on personal time, regardless of whether compensated, are not subject to these Board of Higher Education and institution policies.

(2) Identify the name(s) or title(s) of institutional administrator(s) assigned respon-
sibility for reviewing and acting on requests to engage in outside activities related to the faculty member's institutional responsibilities as referenced in (1) above.

(3) Identify and describe types of outside faculty activity related to faculty institutional responsibilities and associated funding sources which the institution approves as a class(es) and which will not require review and prior approval, such as health care faculty clinical activities, services as an expert witness, and services other than those identified in 4.010 (4) and (6) below. If, however, the particular activity under the class creates a potential conflict of interest, the faculty member shall provide a written disclosure thereof to a designated supervisor in accordance with (4) and (5) herein.

(4) Require faculty to disclose to the named institutional administrator(s) in writing, and to receive prior approval on a case-by-case basis, to engage in outside activities defined in (1) above involving any or all of the following:

(a) Acceptance of compensation, or ownership of equity in the case of a private entity.

(b) Service in a line management position or participation in day-to-day operations of a private or public entity.

(c) Service in a key, continuing role in the scientific and technical activity of a private or public entity.

Institutional case-by-case approval will not be required if the activity is included within the scope of an institution-defined class as established under (3) above.

(5) Require that the faculty member’s written disclosure, as referenced in (4) above, fully describe the:
(a) Type of work or consulting to be provided to the named entity;

(b) Nature of the relationship (e.g., employer/employee, entity/contractor, or consultant);

(c) Anticipated time commitment;

(d) Expected benefits to the entity, faculty member, and institution;

(e) Use of institutional facilities and support personnel, if any, and method of reimbursing institution for both direct and indirect costs, if institution approves such use; and

(f) Financial arrangements pertaining to funding sources of compensation, including equity ownership and other forms of economic value provided the faculty member or any immediate member of the faculty member's family.

(6) Require the institutional administrator(s) to consider the following when reviewing written requests to engage in outside activities:

(a) Written disclosures identified in (5) above.

(b) Contributions of the relationship to the faculty member's primary obligation to the institution and its support of the academic integrity of the institution as well as the faculty member's interdepartmental relationships.

(c) Prospective nonfinancial benefits to the faculty member and institution.

(d) Average time commitment over an academic term, such commitment not to exceed the limits established by the institution unless the institutional administrator(s) determines that the activity provides extraordinary benefit to both the institution and the participant as a faculty
member. In cases where the time limits are to be exceeded, the faculty member shall disclose the amount of time in excess of the limits, and the institutional administrator(s) shall document in writing the rationale for approving the request to exceed the limits.

(e) Assurances that the outside activity does not interfere with the faculty member's instructional, research, and other related institutional responsibilities, including those to students. Special attention must be given to the intellectual property interests of students who may create and claim ownership to such property developed in the process of completing their academic programs.

(f) Appropriateness of the use of institutional facilities and support personnel, if approved, including written documentation that the full cost thereof will be reimbursed to the institution.

(7) Establish the types, nature, and extent of the information required to be reported under (2) through (6) above, which shall be made a part of a faculty member's confidential personnel record.

(8) Provide a process whereby a faculty member dissatisfied with a decision of an authorized administrator may appeal that administrator's decision to another institutional authority. That authority shall be vested with power to make a final determination relative to authorization to engage in the outside activity.

(9) Provide for the institutional president to report to the Chancellor's Office by August 31 of each year any change in institutional policy on outside activities and evidence of procedures followed in monitoring faculty and family acceptance of compensation and equity for outside activities of the faculty member.

(10) Specify appropriate sanctions against
faculty who fail to comply with Board and institutional policies and procedures concerning outside activities and acceptance of related compensation and equity.

(11) Be submitted to the Chancellor's Office for review and approval prior to adoption.

ORS 351.067

Compensation for Officers and Employees from Other Sources May Be Authorized.

(1) In carrying out its authority under ORS 351.070, the State Board of Higher Education may authorize receipt of compensation for any officer or employee of the State System of Higher Education from private or public resources, including, but not limited to, income from:

(a) Consulting;

(b) Appearances and speeches;

(c) Intellectual property conceived, reduced to practice or originated, and therefore owned within the State System;

(d) Providing services or other valuable consideration for a private corporation, individual, or entity, whether paid in cash or in kind, stock, or other equity interest, or anything of value regardless of whether there is a licensing agreement between the state system and the private entity; and

(e) Performing public duties paid by private organizations, including institution corporate affiliates, which augment an officer's or employee's publicly funded salary. Such income shall be authorized and received in accordance with policies and rules established by the board.

(2) The board shall not authorize compensation, as defined in sub-section (1) of this section, that, in the board's judgment does not comport with the mission of the institution and the
higher education system or substantially interferes with an officer’s or employee’s duties to the state system.

(3) Any compensation, described and authorized under subsection (1) of this section, shall be considered official salary, honorarium or reimbursement of expenses for purposes of ORS 244.040. If authorization or receipt of such compensation creates a potential conflict of interest, the potential conflict shall be reported in writing in accordance with rules of the state board. The disclosure is a public record subject to public inspection.

(4) The state board shall adopt by rule standards governing employee outside employment and activities, including potential conflict of interest, as defined by state board rule and consistent with ORS 244.020 (8), and the public disclosure thereof, and procedures for reporting and hearing potential or actual conflict of interest complaints.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

After thorough discussion, the Committee asked the staff to complete more work on the amendments and return to the Committee and Board with revisions.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board concurred with the recommendation of the Committee and delayed action on the amendments until such time as the identified issues could be resolved.

Staff Report to the Board

The Board’s Internal Management Directive 7.100 requires each institution to prepare a long-range campus development plan to serve as a basis for making decisions about the facilities needed to support its instructional, research, and service programs. OAR 580-50-001 (1) requires that the Board find that any such plan comply with Statewide Planning goals and be compatible with applicable local comprehensive plans. These provisions
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were updated by the Board in 1990 in order to conform with State law.

The University of Oregon's campus development has been guided by planning and design principles first enunciated in 1914 by the University's Dean of Architecture, Ellis Lawrence, and updated by him in 1923 and 1932. The plan in effect for the University today is the approach that flows from the work of Christopher Alexander called "The Oregon Experiment," completed in 1973. However, the University has not yet had a campus master plan adopted under the State of Oregon's new standards.

In 1990, the University of Oregon initiated an effort to bring the present planning environment into compliance with the Board's new rule and internal management directive. The University's planning office worked with a large number of University committees, community organizations, and City of Eugene representatives to develop a document consistent with the University's planning principles and traditions, and with the requirements of the City, and the Land Conservation and Development Commission.

The resulting document is the University's "Long Range Campus Development Plan," provided for the Board's review and approval. The plan also is being reviewed by, and offered for, approval to the City of Eugene's Planning Commission. The concurrence of both the City and the Board is needed for fulfillment of the OAR and IMD requirements, and approval of the plan is necessary if the University is to move to construction of new projects.

This plan is the second to be reviewed by the Board since the adoption of the new requirements for compatibility with State and local planning goals and comprehensive plans. The plan for Southern Oregon State College was adopted in September, 1990. (The Oregon Health Sciences University is in the process of updating its Framework Master Plan to meet a City of Portland mandate. Other colleges and universities appear to be in compliance with the requirements. Oregon State University is renewing its campus master plan and may seek Board concurrence with some redirection later.)

The plan is founded on several principles that will
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Guide the development of campus facilities and provide a framework within which the plans of individual departments and schools may be prepared and evaluated.

The principles restate the current physical situation of the University and assume that these will not change appreciably but that the University may change aspects such as programs and enrollment over time in ways that cannot be foreseen adequately. Therefore, the plan depicts what is, and provides a process within which the University can change to meet its changing mission and environment. The primacy of academic program planning is underscored, and the responsibility for campus planning to meet academic needs is vested in the campus planning committee -- a group that advises the president.

Every two years the University will adopt a biennial implementation plan reflecting its construction/renovation needs for the following fiscal period. This implementation plan will be in conformity with the overall Long Range Campus Development Plan.

The Long Range Campus Development Plan is divided into several sections. The introduction contains a background statement, a list of assumptions, and a description of how the plan will be reviewed and revised over time. The remaining sections enunciate development policies and depict how the University is affected by adopted neighborhood and transportation plans for the Eugene/Springfield area. They also portray the University's maintenance, service, utilities, and space allocation policies.

The staff has reviewed the proposed Long Range Campus Development Plan for the University of Oregon. It is somewhat unorthodox in that it does not pin down specific locations for specific buildings and functions. Further, its approach and language differ from those typically used in documents of this type.

However, the staff believes that the plan, when taken as a whole, meets the requirements of the Board's rule and State law with regard to comprehensive plan coordination. It provides a logical and cohesive framework for considering the Univer-
University's land use and construction proposals and clarifies the processes the University will use in developing such proposals. If approved by the City of Eugene (which, along with community representatives, participated in its development), the Long Range Campus Development Plan will meet all legal requirements for such documents.

The approval by the Board of the master plan will in no way obligate the Board to approve any specific capital construction project or to give a project any particular priority within the System. It does provide a starting point for the review of any capital construction request made by, or on behalf of, the University of Oregon.

**Staff Recommendation to the Committee**

The staff recommended that the Board find that the campus master plan prepared by the University of Oregon, "Long Range Campus Development Plan," complies with Statewide Planning goals and, if approved by the City of Eugene, will be compatible with applicable acknowledged comprehensive plans. The staff recommended further that the Board accept and approve the "Long Range Campus Development Plan" as the long-range campus development plan for the University of Oregon, subject to its approval by the City of Eugene. Finally, the staff recommended that the "Long Range Campus Development Plan" be reviewed by the Board again for sufficiency and currency no later than 1996.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

The Committee heard a presentation by representatives of the University of Oregon. Of particular interest to the Committee was the way in which academic planning had been considered as integral to the development of the long-range plan. Every two years the University will review implementation of the plan as it reflects the construction and renovation needs for the following fiscal year. The Committee concurred that, although the plan differs from other plans of this nature, it provides a cohesive framework for land use and construction proposals.

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.
Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report

University Hospital requests authorization to provide resident, or housestaff, a 5.3 percent pay increase, effective July 1, 1991.

University Hospital, as well as the Portland Council of Teaching Hospitals (an association of hospitals whose facilities provide the focus of graduate medical education in the Portland areas) is concerned that University Hospital's salaries are falling behind those of other non-California western university hospitals and schools of medicine. University Hospital currently ranks 12th out of 14 comparator institutions in starting salaries for first-year resident staff. To assist in addressing this salary disparity the past two years, University Hospital has granted salary increases one percentage point above the average granted by comparator hospitals. This policy of a one percentage point increase above the average of the non-California western university hospitals is proposed to continue in 1991-1992. For 1991-1992, the average increase at the comparator institutions is estimated at 4.3 percent. Therefore, University Hospital is proposing an increase of 5.3 percent.

The projected costs associated with this salary increase have been planned for in the 1991-1992 budget as included in the Board's biennial budget request, and incorporated in the level of support being recommended by the Ways and Means Education Subcommittee.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

The staff recommended that the Board of Higher Education authorize Oregon Health Sciences University Hospital to grant a 5.3 percent pay increase for resident, or housestaff, effective July 1, 1991.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee's recommendation with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Miller, Wilson, Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

The Board of Higher Education authorizes the establishment of all capital construction projects and approves the budgets or limitations for all of them. The formal creation of the projects is done by the Legislative Assembly or the State Emergency Board.

In addition, the Assembly generally requires that an authorized project be reviewed again by the Emergency Board prior to proceeding to construction. This sets up a double review. Historically, the staff has sought authorization from the Board to request the Emergency Board's approval to proceed to construction. In some cases, this was accompanied by a request to change the scope or budget/limitation of the project. In other cases, no changes have occurred from the project as originally approved by the Board.

Of the 25 projects originally approved by the Board for 1989-1991, 21 have proceeded to construction. All 21 were discussed with the Board at the time of their original approval in the summer of 1988 and again prior to seeking Emergency Board clearance to proceed to construction. Only four of the 21 had their budgets/limitations changed. The other 17 proceeded to construction within the scope and the original amounts allocated.

The staff suggested that the Board continue to consider and approve new projects as well as those projects for which the scope or budget/limitation is proposed to change. However, approval by the Board would include authorization for the staff to seek Emergency Board approval to proceed to con-
Staff Recommendation to the Board

It was recommended that the Board authorize the staff to request approval from the Legislative Assembly or Emergency Board for release of funds for construction for all Board-approved projects for which there are no changes in the scope or budget/limitation.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

In 1989, the Legislative Assembly approved an Other Funds Limitation of $12,685,000 for renovation work at the University Hospital. This was part of a multi-year effort, adopted by Oregon Health Sciences University in 1986, to upgrade the hospital’s out-of-date facilities. Much of the work was approved in 1987-1989 and has been carried out over the past four years. Several subprojects have now proceeded through the design phase and are ready for construction. The University Hospital believes the work should proceed as quickly as possible to fit in with other construction/renovation work and to minimize the adverse effects on patients and care providers.

Therefore, officials of the Oregon Health Sciences University have requested that the Board authorize staff to seek authorization from the Legislative Assembly or the Emergency Board to expend $4,675,000 of the 1989-1991 Other Funds Limitation
for Hospital Renovations for the following efforts: electrical system improvements (some of which tie into the general upgrade of antiquated and frequently failing campus electrical systems already underway) -- $875,000; the replacement of the roof on University Hospital North -- $400,000; operating room and other improvements to University Hospital South (including the hospital’s connection to the new bridge to the Veterans Administration Hospital) -- $1,950,000; and $1,000,000 to replace scattered and outdated clinical laboratories in newly configured space in the University’s Marquam Complex.

The electrical and roof work is in the nature of repair. The operating room improvements are expected to prevent the University Hospital from losing more paying patients to other hospitals. The connection to the Veteran’s Administration Bridge will facilitate the large volume of traffic between the Veteran’s Administration and Oregon Health Sciences University medical facilities and will make it easier for Veteran’s Administration patients to utilize facilities and programs at the University Hospital and the Casey Eye Institute. The consolidation of clinical laboratories off Marquam Hill in the newly acquired Marquam Plaza and Marquam II buildings will provide needed updating of clinical labs in a single location. Presently, the outdated and inefficient clinical laboratories used by the hospital are scattered in several locations. This work also will free up critically needed lab space on the Hill.

**Staff Recommendation to the Board**

The staff concurred with the request of the Oregon Health Sciences University and recommended that the Board authorize staff to seek authorization from the Legislative Assembly or the Emergency Board to expend $4,675,000 of Other Funds for Hospital renovations.

**Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee**

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

**Board Discussion and Action**

The Board approved the Committee recommendation.
with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

INCREASE IN OTHER FUNDS LIMITATION AND AUTHORIZATION TO EXPEND OTHER FUNDS, NEUROSENSORY CENTER, OHSU

Staff Report to the Board

In July, 1990, the Board approved an Other Funds Limitation of $25 million for the construction of a Neurosensory Center at the Oregon Health Sciences University. This facility will house multi-disciplinary groups of researchers investigating the brain and nervous system at the cellular level. This research is critical to advancements in understanding and treatment of deafness and such neurological disorders as Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and Huntington's diseases. Other fields include research into schizophrenia, depression, and drug addiction. The Governor included this project in the 1991-1993 Capital Construction Budget request for higher education.

The 70,000-square-foot facility will be funded by $22 million of already approved federal grants and from $3.4 million of gifts. After the Board approved the original request last year, the Federal government required the addition of more equipment at a cost of $400,000 that will be paid from additional gift funds.

An architect and a construction manager/general contractor have been selected for the project. In order to award a guaranteed maximum price contract to the construction manager/general contractor, authorization to expend funds for construction must be sought from the Legislative Assembly or the Emergency Board. Officials at the Oregon Health Sciences University have requested authorization.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff concurred with the request of the Oregon Health Sciences University and recommended that the Board authorize the staff to seek from the Legislative Assembly or the Emergency Board an increase in the Other Funds Limitation for the Neurosensory Center of $400,000 and the authorization to expend $25,400,000 for the construction of the Neurosensory Center at the Oregon Health Sciences University.
Discussion and Recommendation by the Committee

The Committee recommended Board approval of the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Committee

Institutional officials at the Oregon Health Sciences University have indicated to the Board’s office their desire that the Animal Farm in Washington County be declared surplus and offered for sale. The farm was acquired in 1964 as a gift from the Medical Research Foundation of Oregon (MRF) for the purpose of developing animal stocks to support the medical research at the University. Inasmuch as the university no longer requires use of the farm to support its research programs, it wishes to dispose of the property and improvements.

The gift of land and improvements (house, barn, and various outbuildings used to house animals) was valued at approximately $130,000 in 1964 and was encumbered by a mortgage with an unpaid balance of $30,000, which was subsequently paid by the University using indirect cost allowances. There were no restrictions attached to the gift, thus allowing the University to dispose of the property.

The current assessment by Washington County places a value of $456,000 on the approximately 173 acres. A January, 1990, appraisal set a market value of $330,000 for the property and designated the highest and best use as continued agricultural use, including a livestock operation or conversion of pasture to cropland for orchard or vineyard cultivation. The farm is currently divided between two farming/forestry land use designations.

Disposition of the property would be in accordance with existing state rules and regulations, including offering the property to other state agencies before advertising the property for sale to the
general public at a minimum price not less than the fair market value as indicated by appraisals of the property.

Staff Recommendation to the Committee

It was recommended that the animal farm be declared surplus to the needs of the Board of Higher Education and offered for sale in accordance with the provisions of Oregon Statutes.

Discussion and Action by the Committee

The Committee recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the Committee recommendation with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

The Internal Audit Division's Annual Report for the year ended June 30, 1991, summarizing audits completed, audits in progress, EDP audits, and Oregon State System of Higher Education responses to state and federal audits was submitted to the Chancellor and members of the Board and to the State of Oregon Executive Department as required by Executive Department Administrative Rule 15-001-03.

Committee Discussion

Dr. Peter Hughes, Director of the Internal Audit Division for the State System, presented a report of the work of the Division. Included in the report was an introduction, review of two Administrative Rules from the Executive Department affecting higher education, highlights of audit activities for the year just ending, and a review of the Biennial Audit Plan.

Dr. Hughes observed that the Audit Division had received full cooperation and support of the Chancellor's Office and the institutions in the fulfillment of their duties. The institutions had provided full and free access to staff and records, responded quickly to requests for information and
changes, and, for the majority of audit findings, implemented the recommended corrective actions.

In addition, Dr. Hughes indicated that he had great latitude in developing the audit agenda; direct access to the Chancellor or the chair of the Committee on Administration and Finance; and that the Annual Report had come directly from the Audit Division with no interference from the Chancellor’s Office. The Committee expressed their support for the Audit Division’s independence and agreed with the continuation of these practices.

The Committee expressed concern about the low level of staffing for the Audit Division, indicating that, historically, the Audit Division’s staffing level as a ratio of auditors per $100 million of budget funds ranked close to last place compared to other state systems. This should be of concern to the Board because the level of audit activities is keyed to, and controlled by, the number of auditors available.

Ms. Wilson asked if the lack of staff left the State System vulnerable or meant that necessary work could not be completed. Dr. Hughes responded that the low level of staffing did leave the State System with audit exposure and precluded performing necessary audits as identified in the audit plans. The State System’s audit exposure is reduced by building on the audit experience of other state systems. The State System’s audit coverage also is being increased by training management to conduct some internal control reviews and assessments as part of their regular duties.

Mr. Bruggere asked Dr. Hughes to list the most important areas of concern. Dr. Hughes responded that there are three areas of concern. The first is to maintain the independence and objectivity of the Audit Division established in past years. Vice Chancellor Ihrig continues to foster an atmosphere as free of political pressures as possible. The second area of concern relates to the staffing of the Audit Division. The Audit Division’s staffing level should serve as a warning signal indicating that potential audit exposure is a situation that should be monitored by the Committee. Finally, the level of interaction between the Director and the Administration and Finance Committee should be
increased. A recent survey of other comparable state systems indicates that audit directors reported to the boards on an average of four to six times per year. The Committee concurred that more frequent reports were warranted and requested that the Director report quarterly to the Board. At these meetings, the Board should discuss the status of current audits, the impact of any new rules or regulations affecting the State System, new audit issues and other potential areas of concern. Finally, it was agreed that the Director should meet independently on a regular basis with the chair of the Committee on Administration and Finance.

(No Board Action Required)

Executive Summary

Professors Dona Beattie and Robert Nicholas are administrators within the Division of Continuing Education and Summer Session. Both have indefinite tenure and were formerly, respectively, Assistant Dean and Dean of Continuing Education. When the Division was reorganized, Dr. Nicholas was not selected as Dean. He and Ms. Beattie were granted sabbatical leaves. The new Dean, Dr. Sherwin Davidson, reviewed potential reassignments that would be consistent with both Ms. Beattie’s and Dr. Nicholas’ skills and the Division’s needs. When they returned from sabbatical leaves January 1, 1991, they were reassigned, and beginning July 1, 1991, their salaries will be adjusted to reflect more accurately new responsibilities. Professors Beattie and Nicholas grieved to President Judith Ramaley about their reassignments and salary reductions and President Ramaley denied their grievances. Board President Mark Dodson designated M. R. Parelius to review the appeal to the Board. Mr. Parelius found that their reassignments did not violate any rule, law, obligation, or past practice and that their new salaries are fair.

Staff Report

On March 15, 1991, Assistant Professor Dona Beattie wrote to Chancellor Bartlett requesting that the Board review President Ramaley’s decision in response to Professor Beattie’s and Professor Nicholas’ grievance. On April 16, 1991, as provid-
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ed in the Board’s rule, OAR 580-21-055(3), Board President Dodson designated M. R. Parelius, currently Director, Technology Management, Oregon Health Sciences University, to review the grievances for the Board. Mr. Parelius’ report follows:

"I’ve reviewed the materials provided by the Office of Administration, Oregon State System of Higher Education and Portland State University; Oregon Administrative Rules, Board of Higher Education, Chapter 580; the Portland State University Faculty Grievance Procedure (adopted pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule 580); and the Agreement between Portland State University and AAUP-PSU, July 1, 1989 through June 30, 1991.

"The document understood to be the grievance is referenced as Exhibit A (three pages in length) and was attached to the February 15, 1991, memo to President Judith A. Ramaley from Dona G. Beattie and Robert A. Nicholas. The grievance states there have been violations of ‘... state and federal laws, Oregon Administrative Rules, principles and provisions of trust and collegiality as enunciated by Portland State University, and University past practices.’ No specific portions of any of the documents are cited and claims made of their violation. The grievances basically state that the actions of Portland State University have been unfair.

"Because of the lack of specificity regarding 'state and federal laws,' my only review of this charge was to determine if, from my experience in University administration, there was an apparent violation of any law in the actions of Portland State University. I found none.

"The Oregon Administrative Rules, Board of Higher Education, do not directly address the points raised in the grievance. The closest section found was 580-21-318, Other Personnel Actions Not for Cause. This section authorizes the Chancellor and the institution presidents to transfer and reassign personnel in accordance with university staffing needs. Portland State University’s actions are not in conflict with this Rule.

"The claim that past practice was violated was discussed with Associate Provost Michael Reardon."
Since no specifics were offered by the grievants, the discussion was general. However, Dr. Reardon immediately thought of two similar situations; in both instances salaries had been lowered and duties had been changed. Thus, the action is not seen as contrary to prior practice.

"The vagueness of the grievances make it difficult to review; however, the following specific points can be made from the review of the grievances and the various materials cited:

1. The grievants are tenured faculty. The actions by Portland State University did not affect their status.

2. The positions to which the grievants have been reassigned are within their areas of competence/expertise.

3. The salaries paid the grievants are substantially above other faculty with similar duties. It is clear Portland State University administrators took the grievants' many years of experience into consideration when the new salary levels were set.

4. All tenured faculty in the Continuing Education/Summer School Department are informed on their Notices of Appointment that indefinite tenure extends only to the extent funds are available in the Department's set of financial accounts. The grievants' status is no different than other tenured faculty in the Department.

5. The grievants have not been denied access to the appropriate grievance procedure. They were ineligible for membership in the Portland State University - AAUP-PSU Agreement. They were eligible for the Faculty Grievance Procedure adopted pursuant to Oregon Administrative Rule 580-21-050 and have been heard by President Ramaley at their request.

6. Neither the Dean of the Continuing Education/Summer School Department nor the Vice Provost have denied them consultative privileges or discussion, nor do they know of any denial of such, as claimed by grievants.
"In summary:

"The University and its administrative officers have violated no known State or Federal law, Oregon Administrative rule, enunciated Portland State University provision of trust and collegiality or Portland State University past practice.

"The new salaries for the grievants are fair.

"The new assignment of duties is not unreasonable nor a violation of any rules or regulation pertaining to the University."

Staff Recommendation to the Board

Staff recommended that the Board adopt the findings of its designee and affirm President Judith Ramsey's decision.

Board Discussion and Action

Ms. Grier pointed out that Board members received a letter from Professors Beattie and Nicholas requesting that the item be tabled. However, in reviewing Mr. Parelius' report, she concluded that the report accurately reflected a fair evaluation and made appropriate recommendations.

One issue the grievance mentioned was that the parties believe they had been improperly excluded from use of the bargaining unit to which other faculty in similar positions had access. This claim was examined regarding the records of faculty on the list who were reassigned in the past ten years. With perhaps the exception of one faculty member, if other individuals mentioned in the Beattie/Nicholas letter remained at the same salary levels when reassigned, it was because the positions to which they were reassigned were at comparable levels of responsibility. Beattie/Nicholas failed to note that two individuals, Jim Heath and Rod Diman, who had been reassigned (one from Executive Assistant to the President and the other from Vice Provost) had received downward readjustments. Current practice at Portland State University is to adjust salary, either up or down, when a reassignment is made.

Ms. Grier continued that the Division of Continuing...
Education and Summer Session had experienced serious financial difficulties, and the assumption was that Dr. Martino, in his correspondence to Beattie and Nicholas, intended to alert the parties of severe financial difficulties, and that financial exigency was being considered for the Division.

Ms. Wilson asked for clarification regarding the point that the salaries the parties were making were based on what they had been paid over time and they had not received additional monies for additional responsibilities.

Ms. Grier responded that both parties had been in their respective positions for a long period of time and their positions were as non-teaching administrators. Their situation is unique compared to others mentioned, since others were administrators with tenure in a department -- they were teaching faculty. Professors Beattie and Nicholas have been employed by the State System for over 20 years, always in administrative positions. Therefore, their salaries have accrued as their positions have changed, making it difficult to make comparisons. The positions to which they were reassigned were examined and compared with other similar positions. Dr. Sherwin Davidson, Dean of Continuing Education and Summer Session, took this (and their present salaries) into consideration and made substantial adjustments upward in recognition of longevity, and because the new assignments would have created great disparity in salary.

Ms. Wilson noted that it seemed unusual for the individuals to file a joint, not single, complaint, and inquired if the Board should treat these as two separate items.

Ms. Grier confirmed that it was unusual for individuals to file a complaint jointly and indicated that the initial appeal came under Ms. Beattie's signature. Ms. Grier indicated that Portland State University officials have consistently examined and dealt with the parties individually and that, procedurally, the Board should ask the parties to separate the complaints.

Mr. Bruggere asked about the reference in the letter to Portland State University’s employe practices. Is there reason to believe that prob-
lems have existed over the years in employe practices and, if so, is anything being done to correct them?

President Judith Ramaley indicated that the difficulty in this particular case is the uniqueness of the employment relationship. Originally the parties were part of the System-wide continuing education administration. When that changed a few years ago, the individuals were assigned to campuses. There was no mechanism to assign them to an operating unit of the institution. Therefore, the situation to which the parties referred is not specific to general employment practices or personnel practices that are standard and customary. The current problem is unique in two other regards. One, there is no other employment status similar to this in the System. They are a remnant of a way of operating that no longer exists. Second, the parties insist on being treated professionally together. For those reasons, it has been difficult to accommodate their particular demands.

Mr. Bruggere continued by asking if, apart from the current issue, there were any reasons to suspect problems with Portland State University's employe practices and if they should be reviewed.

President Ramaley indicated that, to her knowledge, there were none.

Vice Chancellor Ihrig underscored that, from the standpoint of the Office of Personnel of the Chancellor's Office, there were no concerns.

Mr. Bailey asked if Ms. Grier and the Chancellor's Office were satisfied that all procedural details had been handled sufficiently. Ms. Grier indicated that there were no problems but that the parties had chosen to follow an unusual procedure in that they bypassed the campus hearing committee and went directly to the Portland State University president. Once that occurred, with a request for her direct review, it appeared inappropriate to send it back to a committee and then back to the president. Because of this situation, Mr. Parelius actually did more investigation than would normally have occurred. All procedures had been carefully followed.
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It was moved and seconded that the Board approve the staff recommendation. The following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Staff Report to the Board

At the October 19, 1990, meeting, the Board, in response to an Oregon Court of Appeals decision in Merrick v. Board of Higher Education, reluctantly amended Administrative Rules, OAR 580-15-010, 580-15-065, 580-22-050, prohibiting sexual orientation discrimination. The Board’s only purpose in amending the rules was to attempt to avoid litigation in which its position was not adversarial to petitioner’s. The Oregon Department of Justice has advised that the Board’s original rules were valid. Because staff believes that the original rules more succinctly express the Board’s stated intent, it is proposed that the rules be amended to the original form.

Staff Recommendation to the Board

The staff recommended that the Board amend its rules as follows:

OAR 580-15-010 As used in rules 580-15-010 to 580-15-160, "discrimination" means any act that either in form or operation, and whether intended or unintended, unreasonably differentiates among persons on the basis of age, handicap, national origin, race, marital status, religion, sex or sexual orientation. [Nothing in this section shall create rights or require actions inconsistent with state statutes, including, but not limited to, ORS 236.380.]

OAR 580-15-065 (1) Institutions and divisions shall assure that nondiscriminatory policies are followed in student employment. Discrimination grievances arising out of student employment shall be addressed using the procedures required by or described in OAR 580-15-015 and 580-15-090 through 155.

(2) Institutions and divisions shall not assist prospective employers or agencies known by them to discriminate on a prohibited basis in their recruitment, hiring, or employment practices. Place-
ment officers and other Department personnel who assist in the recruiting and hiring of students shall take steps to inform prospective employers of the requirements of nondiscrimination under the law.

[(3) Nothing in this section shall create rights or require actions inconsistent with state statutes, including, but not limited to, ORS 236.380.]

OAR 580-22-050 No institution or division shall discriminate in employment based on race, color, religion, national origin, handicap, age, marital status, sex, or sexual orientation. [Nothing in this section shall create rights or require actions inconsistent with state statutes, including, but not limited to, ORS 236.380.].

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the staff recommendation and on roll call vote, the following voted in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Richardson, Swanson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.

Mr. Dodson called on Mr. Adams to present the report of the Nominating Committee.

Mr. Adams indicated that Mr. Dodson and Ms. Jackson were the other members of the Committee. The Committee submitted the following slate of officers for 1991-1992: President, George Richardson, Jr.; Vice President, Bob Bailey; Executive Committee Members, Janice Wilson, Rob Miller, and Robert Adams. The chairs of the standing committees will be appointed by the new president.

Board Discussion and Action

The Board approved the recommendations of the Nominating Committee with the following voting in favor: Directors Adams, Bailey, Bruggere, Davis, Halsey, Jackson, Miller, Swanson, Richardson, Wilson, and Dodson. Those voting no: None.
A summary of activities within the Office of Finance and Administration's Facilities Division is presented below:

Contracts for Professional Consulting Services

- An Agreement was negotiated with McBride/Ralston Architects, Architects, Portland, for architectural services not to exceed $30,000. Financing will be provided from state funds.
- An Agreement was negotiated with SRG Partnership PC, Architects, Portland, for architectural services not to exceed $126,330. Financing will be provided from gifts and grants.

Award of Construction Contracts

- On June 10, 1991, Umpqua Roofing Co., Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $185,118. Financing will be provided from housing reserve funds.
- On June 24, 1991, J. T. Stephens Construction Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $193,067. Financing will be provided from state funds.
- On May 21, 1991, Michael A. Becker General Contractor, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $65,946. Financing will be provided from state funds.
- On June 10, 1991, Morris P. Kielty General Contractor, was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $19,686. Financing will be provided from state funds.
- On June 11, 1991, Ponder Burner Co. was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $439,095. Financing will be provided from departmental funds at the institution.
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On May 21, 1991, Kast Construction, Inc., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $58,061. Financing will be provided from student building reserve funds.

On June 15, 1991, MRK Electric was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $15,250. Financing will be provided from state funds.

On June 5, 1991, Donald M. Drake Co., was awarded a contract for this project in the amount of $2,312,900. Financing will be provided from hospital funds.

Acceptance of Projects

The Architecture and Allied Arts Addition and Alterations: Bid Package B, Lawrence Hall project is complete and was accepted on April 15, 1991. The estimated total project cost remains at $4,953,479. Financing was provided from state funds.

(No Board action required.)

Mr. Bailey indicated he had participated in Commencement activities at Southern Oregon State College. The visit was excellent and he commended President Cox and staff for the impressive things occurring on that campus. Mr. Bailey indicated that the Board faces a challenge, beginning with the July renewal, in advocacy strengthening for higher education and relationship building with constituencies.

Ms. Davis thanked Eastern Oregon State College for their hospitality during activities on the campus.

Mr. Bruggere remarked that the Portland State University Commencement was an historic event: the first commencement in Oregon presided over by a woman president at which a woman governor delivered the keynote address. "It was fun, an honor, and very interesting to be part of the ceremony," concluded Mr. Bruggere.
Mr. Miller indicated he was honored to be part of the ceremony at Western Oregon State College and to have the opportunity of hearing Mrs. Holt of the Holt Adoption Agency present the keynote address.

Mr. Swanson attended the graduation at Oregon State University and he thanked President Byrne and Oregon State University for their gracious hospitality. He indicated there had been no keynote speaker, since the institution has a tradition of individually presenting diplomas to students. Honorary degrees were presented to three distinguished people.

Ms. Jackson reported she had the pleasure of attending the ceremony at Oregon Institute of Technology and thanked President Wolf for the hospitality.

Mr. Richardson thanked President Gilbert and Eastern Oregon State College for their hospitality at the commencement activities. In addition, Mr. Richardson thanked the Board members for their confidence in him expressed through his election to the presidency. He indicated his willingness to work hard on the challenges and opportunities facing the Board and would try to provide the type of excellent leadership of outgoing president, Mark Dodson, as well as predecessors, in particular Dick Hensley, who had been a mentor to him.

Mr. Dodson reported that he attended the University of Oregon graduation and thanked President Brand for his hospitality. Additionally, Mr. Dodson commended the Board, presidents, and Chancellor's staff for the fine work during the Legislative session. He thanked the Board for their support during the year of his presidency and indicated that the Board had come to the point of having "interchangeable parts," in that people could put their own interests aside and look at the needs of the Board and the System. "This is a remarkable Board, and it has been a real privilege to serve as chair."

Mr. Adams commended Mr. Dodson on a very productive and industrious year and indicated that "it had been a successful year in so many ways and I think the challenges that have befallen you and been added (given your already busy life), have meant
personal and professional sacrifices, and I commend you for what you have done."

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Virginia L. Thompson, Secretary
Oregon State Board of Higher Education

Mark Dodson, President
APPENDIX A

A summary of reports, requested information, or topics designated for future review or consideration is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Original Presentation</th>
<th>Tentative Presentation Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selective Admissions</td>
<td>04/21/89</td>
<td>Periodic reports on effect at each campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Athletic Funding from Sports Lottery</td>
<td>07-21-89</td>
<td>Report made in January; others to be made as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Expectations re Expenditure of Unrestricted Funds</td>
<td>09-07-89</td>
<td>September 1990 (Not ready yet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Education--Institutional Plans, including graduate education</td>
<td>11-16-89</td>
<td>June 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue Discussion: Diversity &amp; Educational Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S. Degree in Health &amp; Safety Administration, OSU -- Review along with state-wide plan in three years</td>
<td>12-14-89</td>
<td>December 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated Plan for Delivery of Health Administration &amp; Public Health Programs</td>
<td>12-14-89</td>
<td>December 1991 (Update)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of Women and Minorities in High Administrative Positions</td>
<td>01-19-90</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOSC Double Major Designation</td>
<td>05-18-90</td>
<td>May 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Athletic Financing</td>
<td>06-14-90</td>
<td>September 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Annual reports requested, with others when budgets are forecasted to be out of balance.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAR 580-40-041, Revolving Charge Account Policy</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Undergraduate Exchange Program</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Original Presentation</td>
<td>Tentative Presentation Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Joint Graduate Schools of Engineering</td>
<td>07-20-90</td>
<td>July 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Alternative Tuition Models</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>Pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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